

2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
Mississippi

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section	Pages
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope	
1.2 Survey Submittals	
2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary	4-5
Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):	
Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)	
Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)	

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in Mississippi. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 17 Feb 06. Out of the responses received, in Mississippi, 746 of a possible 1010 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .739, for a rating of 73.9%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of “Satisfied”. The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around color quality/resolution. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below: Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q7, “Is the imagery useful for government coordination, for example, in communications with other Federal, State or local agencies?” Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q2, “Were the dates the imagery was flown useful for crop compliance work?”

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	3.470588235	Mean	4.3125	Mean	3.8125	Mean	3.705882353	Mean	3.411764706
Standard Error	0.333405413	Standard Error	0.150519932	Standard Error	0.331897951	Standard Error	0.351098129	Standard Error	0.243425667
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	3
Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	3
Standard Deviation	1.374665735	Standard Deviation	0.602079729	Standard Deviation	1.327591805	Standard Deviation	1.447614671	Standard Deviation	1.003669737
Sample Variance	1.889705882	Sample Variance	0.3625	Sample Variance	1.7625	Sample Variance	2.095588235	Sample Variance	1.007352941
Kurtosis	-0.807570137	Kurtosis	-0.377363421	Kurtosis	-0.521122658	Kurtosis	-0.664338742	Kurtosis	-0.813414216
Skewness	-0.50327056	Skewness	-0.204545517	Skewness	-0.782243836	Skewness	-0.816830724	Skewness	0.273449069
Range	4	Range	2	Range	4	Range	4	Range	3
Minimum	1	Minimum	3	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	59	Sum	69	Sum	61	Sum	63	Sum	58
Count	17	Count	16	Count	16	Count	17	Count	17
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	3.588235294	Mean	3.117647059	Mean	4.117647059	Mean	7.411764706	Mean	7.411764706
Standard Error	0.258087188	Standard Error	0.24074567	Standard Error	0.224956743	Standard Error	0.588235294	Standard Error	0.56268019
Median	4	Median	3	Median	4	Median	8	Median	8
Mode	3	Mode	3	Mode	5	Mode	8	Mode	8
Standard Deviation	1.064120736	Standard Deviation	0.992619825	Standard Deviation	0.927520414	Standard Deviation	2.42535625	Standard Deviation	2.319989858
Sample Variance	1.132352941	Sample Variance	0.985294118	Sample Variance	0.860294118	Sample Variance	5.882352941	Sample Variance	5.382352941
Kurtosis	-1.120034696	Kurtosis	-0.399045285	Kurtosis	-0.084305438	Kurtosis	-0.06256	Kurtosis	-1.220747111
Skewness	-0.084210735	Skewness	0.608971931	Skewness	-0.788795503	Skewness	-0.786688553	Skewness	-0.434333913
Range	3	Range	3	Range	3	Range	8	Range	6
Minimum	2	Minimum	2	Minimum	2	Minimum	2	Minimum	4
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	61	Sum	53	Sum	70	Sum	126	Sum	126
Count	17	Count	17	Count	17	Count	17	Count	17

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

